

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on November 29, 2002, claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 27 has been amended to address this rejection. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §12, second paragraph, now be withdrawn.

Independent claims 17 and 27 are each rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Berghoff. Dependent claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Berghoff in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,882,695 (Starkey) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,975,881 (Langos).

Independent claims 17 and 27 have each been amended to include the limitations of claim 22. Accordingly, we will argue the rejection of claim 22.

The present invention relates to an injection compression mold with a mold and a drive for moving parts of the mold. More specifically, the mold includes two plates 2, 2' which are movable by at least one threaded screw assembly 7a, 7b, or 7c to a position in which their end faces 3, 3' meet to define a mold parting plane. The opposing faces include a first negative form 4. An insert 5 is connected to a separate screw drive assembly 7 and includes a second negative form 4' of the mold. The two plates 2, 2' and the insert 5 define a cavity 16 in which a molding composition is inserted. After the molding composition is inserted, the insert 5 is moved by the screw drive assembly 7 to reduce the size of the cavity 16 to compress the molding composition (see page 7, line 34 to page 8, line 2).

Independent claim 1 is amended to recite a mold insert having a second negative form of the molded part to be produced and arranged in said first and second plates and a second threaded screw drive assembly connected for positioning said second negative form of said mold

insert relative to said first negative form while said first and second plates are held in a closed position.

Berghoff discloses a injection molding apparatus in which two plates 16a, 16b of the mold are movable by a screw assembly. As stated in the Office Action, Berghoff fails to disclose a mold insert.

Starkey fails to teach what Berghoff lacks. Starkey discloses a demountable mold pin and bushing system and a replaceable bushing therefor. The insert 66 referred to in the Office Action is not a mold insert with a second negative form of the mold, as recited in independent claim 17. Rather, insert 66 is an insert in a bushing 68 through which a pin 26 which are used to facilitate ejection of the molded piece. There is no teaching or suggestion that these inserts 66 disclosed by Starkey include a second negative form of the molded part to be produced. Referring to Fig. 1 of Starkey, the cavity 20 is remote from the pins 26. Therefore, the bushings in part 30 do not form part of the mold. Accordingly, the combined teaching or Berghoff and Starkey fails to teach or suggest the claimed mold insert.

Langos also fails to disclose a mold insert as claimed. Langos discloses a blow molding machine in which two parts are independently moveable by separate screw drives. However, Langos fails to teach a mold inserted in the two parts. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Berghoff, Starkey, and Langos fails to teach or suggest the claimed mold insert. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 17 is allowable.

Independent claim 27 has been amended to recited the step of moving the mold insert having the second negative form of the molded part to be produced via the second threaded

screw drive assembly while the first and second plates are held in the closed position to reduce the size of the cavity and compress the molding composition in the cavity.


As discussed above, the combined disclosures of Berghoff, Starkey and Langos fail to teach or suggest the claimed mold insert having a second negative form of the mold. Accordingly, these references fail to teach or suggest the step of moving the mold insert to reduce the size of the cavity when the plates are in the closed position as recited in independent claim 27. In view of the above amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 27 is allowable over Berghoff, Starkey, and Langos.

Dependent claims 18-21, 23-26, and 28-32, each being dependent on one of independent claims 17 or 27, are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claims 17 and 27.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application; however, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By   
Alfred W. Froeblich  
Reg. No. 38,887  
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210  
New York, New York 10176  
(212) 687-2770

Dated: February 28, 2003